

The Alexandria Gazette

FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 15.

In the U. S. House of Representatives, Yesterday.

The House resumed the consideration of the resolution to expel Mr. Long.

Mr. Rogers, of New Jersey, contended that free speech had been recognized by the common law of England from time immemorial. — We must have freedom of debate and of the press in this country, or we must bid farewell to liberty. There were men here who were the representatives of a free constituency, not of old Abe Lincoln, and they would express their opinions at all hazards. You are not content with slandering Vallandigham and other true patriots. [Hisses.] God bless the exile. He prayed the arrows of Heaven would pierce the heart of the despot. You are bringing soldiers here to keep old Abraham, King of America, from being encroached upon by Jefferson Davis of the Southern Confederacy. This is no longer a country of republicanism, but a monarchy and despotism. I go, he said for a dissolution of the Union, in preference to a war of extermination. This fratricidal and ruinous war should be stopped. He wanted the Union as our fathers made it—the Union which gave us peace and prosperity. He wanted the Union with slavery if necessary, or the Union without it.

Mr. Colfax rose to demand the previous question.

Mr. Pendleton said three or four gentlemen on the opposite side desired to speak. The previous question should not be brought to bear to cut off free speech. He therefore appealed to the gentleman not to make that motion until others had been heard.

Mr. Colfax replied that his heart was disposed to accede to the request, but public duty demanded that he should make the motion.—Twenty six speeches have been made, and both sides equally heard. There were fifteen members who yet desired to express their views.—He called attention to the fact that Joshua R. Giddings was expelled under the previous question, without an opportunity of being heard. He felt compelled to demand the previous question.

The House took up the point of order raised by Mr. Eldridge on Tuesday, that the substitute of Mr. Broomall, proposing to censure Mr. Long by declaring him to be an unworthy member of the House, was not in order.

The Speaker pro tem. [Mr. Rollins] declared the substitute in order, as it proposed to censure Mr. Long for publishing his speech in New York to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. Eldridge appealed from the decision of the Chair, and the question being taken the vote stood—yeas 70; nays 65. So the opinion of the Chair was declared to be the judgment of the House.

Mr. Colfax remarked as Mr. Broomall's proposition accomplished a similar object, and as it was evident a sufficient number of votes to expel Mr. Long could not be obtained, he would accept the substitute of Mr. Broomall.

Mr. Cox was anxious for an opportunity to move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. Davis of Maryland, gave notice of his intention to renew the original proposition for expulsion.

The demand for the previous question was seconded—yeas, 76; nays, 71.

The question was stated should the main question be now put? and this was agreed to—yeas, 75; nays, 71.

Mr. Colfax said the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Pendleton] asked on Tuesday, "where are we?" He would reply to the gentleman, we are in the Capitol of the United States, of that Republic which still lives, in spite of treason of enemies open or covert, with or without arms in their hands; and which, thanks to God and our gallant soldiers in the field, will live as long as time shall last.

The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Long] had avowed that our country is dead and destroyed, and that he prefers recognition of the traitor

Confederacy to any alternative left. He would pluck eleven stars from our banner, would see our diplomatic gallery occupied by some Mason or Wigfall, or Beauregard, as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary from a government established on our soil, and the Heights of Arlington frown with hostile cannon, menacing our deliberations in this Capitol. Mr. Cox had called his conduct extraordinary, but he, [Mr. Colfax] had a parallel and a justification. He, [Mr. Cox] had stated in his speech, that his democratic colleagues of Ohio had met in caucus to disavow the sentiments of his colleague [Mr. Long] and further, that he, [Mr. Cox] was authorized so to declare publicly. It was as extraordinary that gentlemen of the same political party should deem it to be their duty to meet in caucus and authorize one of their number to disavow the speech, as for him to offer the resolution he had. If that could be done in the interest of a party, why should he [Mr. Colfax] be criticised for asking the House to solemnly repudiate the speech for the interest of the country?

Mr. Pendleton remarked that he did not know that there had been a caucus, and that his colleague [Mr. Cox] had no authority to speak in his behalf.

Mr. Cox desired to explain, but was not, at the time, afforded an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Colfax, resuming, repeated that he had brought forward his resolution from a firm conviction of duty. As the occupant of the Chair, he was the servant of the House; but on the floor, as a Representative from Indiana, he was the equal of all other gentlemen, no more, no less; and he therefore had the same rights as any other member on this floor. If his own brother, under the solemn oath required by the fiat of this Congress, had made that speech, he should have pursued the same course toward him; not that he loved him less, but his country more. In framing his resolution, he had conferred with no member of this House. He took the responsibility alone.

The only member of the House to whom he did state his purpose, was the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Rollins], a few minutes before he requested him to temporarily occupy the chair. But he did consult with one lifelong friend. After he mentioned to him his purpose, he [his friend] asked, "Do you not know that by offering your resolution you will make yourself a target of attack?" He replied that he had counted the cost, and was willing, for the sake of his country, to become a target of attack. He would have offered the resolution if the next moment had driven him into private life. Before he proceeded to analyze the speech of the gentleman from Ohio, he desired to advert to some things which had been said on the Opposition side. The gentleman from Ohio, [Cox], while he was pleased to speak of his fairness as Speaker of the House, said that he had descended from the chair to the floor of the House. But he had an illustrious example in one whose shoe-latches he was, perhaps, not worthy to unlatch—one who filled the seat the generosity of the House had given to him—the man of lion heart and eagle eye—defamed by some while living, but revered now that he has passed to the spirit-land. Mr. Clay came down from the chair not once, but frequently.

Mr. Mallory supposed the gentleman alluded to the period of 1812, when the Speaker of the House descended from his position to reply to the remarks of Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts. But Mr. Clay did not make a resolution of expulsion.

Mr. Colfax said that, in the Congress of 1812-13, Mr. Clay came down from the chair nine times to make speeches; and, the next session, made six speeches more.

Mr. Mallory. Did Mr. Clay ever move to censure or expel a member?

Mr. Colfax replied, that Mr. Clay's speeches were on the side of the country, and that statesman did not hesitate even about the words he used.

Mr. Dawes called upon Mr. Mallory to state what language Josiah Quincy used to justify Mr. Clay's speech.

Mr. Mallory did not recollect the precise words. He recollected that Mr. Quincy denounced the war as being causeless, and against the interests of Massachusetts, and to which his constituents were opposed.

Mr. Dawes said Josiah Quincy was one of the most venerated and distinguished statesmen of the land. He knew that Mr. Quincy was opposed to the war of 1812, but as a lover of his country, he had no equal at that time.

Mr. Colfax said he did not wish to yield more time, as he feared Massachusetts and Kentucky might get into collision.

Mr. Mallory said the gentleman could not get Kentucky and Massachusetts into collision.

Mr. Colfax, resuming, said if any one had remarked at that time that traitors should be permitted to establish their confederacy on our soil, and that it should be recognized, he believed that Mr. Clay, with all his patriotic impetuosity would have moved to expel the member from this floor.

This was no gladiatorial arena, as called by Mr. Fernando Wood, as it was when men who weapons sought to suppress discussion in behalf of freedom. That time has passed away. They were here as patriots, as representatives, to discharge the duties committed to their charge.

Mr. Colfax quoted some remarks attributed to Fernando Wood, when the latter said it was not true.

In the course of his remarks Mr. Colfax said that the offence of Joshua R. Giddings, in 1842, was the declaration that slavery did not exist in the ships of the United States on the high seas.

Mr. Rogers, of N. J., asked whether Giddings was censured or expelled.

Mr. Colfax then proceeded to review Mr. Long's speech, which, he argued, showed a complicity with treason, and a desire that traitors should triumph.

Mr. Colfax was speaking of Mr. Long's expressed desire for the recognition of the nationality of the Confederacy, when his hour expired, and he asked for a few minutes additional, which had been promised when he yielded out of his time for interruptions.

Mr. Chandler, of New York, objected.

Mr. Long appealed to Mr. Chandler, as a personal favor to himself, to extend the courtesy to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Colfax. No repenting concession from the gentleman from New York [Chandler] will I accept. [Applause.]

Mr. Long, who had obtained the floor, said he was very sorry that Mr. Chandler had made the objection. He would ask the unanimous consent of the House to allow Mr. Colfax to print the remainder of his speech. He trusted this would be granted.

Mr. Colfax. I do not print what I do not utter. Let it go.

Mr. Long said he would not now speak but for the peculiar manner in which the debate had been conducted, and its importance to him individually. On entering the hall on Saturday morning, he heard the clerk, in a clear, shrill voice, reading a resolution for his expulsion. He was still further surprised when he saw that the Speaker of the House had left his exalted position and moved that resolution and was not less surprised at that gentleman's fifteen minutes speech. He did not object to the gentleman offering the resolution—he did not impugn his motives—he did not doubt his right to offer it. He had, with a few exceptions only, been treated with the highest regard and consideration by members, and, therefore, he had no fault to find. They had not impugned his motives or honesty.

For what was he arranged before this great and august assemblage? What was the sum of his offence, and was he fit to associate with these gentlemen? Was it that he had lost his self respect, and had done anything worthy of censure? For four months he had occupied a seat here, and now this extraordinary charge was brought against him. Gentlemen on the other side had complimented him for the manner in which he had conducted himself. We have been called upon for an increase of taxes